

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/973,780	Applicant(s) YONEZAWA, MAKOTO
	Examiner Vincent P. Barth	Art Unit 2877

All Participants: _____

(1) Vincent P. Barth, Examiner. (3) _____.

(2) Yong Choi, Attorney for Applicants. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 December 2003 **Time:** _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Barth had telephoned Attorney Choi regarding the Remarks in the Amendment dated 22 September 2003 which discussed the Specification and Drawings. In particular, the page numbers of some of the elements discussed in the Remarks did not correspond to the pages in the Substitute Specification dated 22 September 2003. Moreover, Examiner Barth wished to discuss whether the additions to the Specification might present any difficulties regarding new matter. For example, Attorney Choi pointed out that although element 46 in Figure 3 had not been previously identified with a numeral in the prior Specification, it was clear from the discussion therein that the "defect detection circuit" discussed therein could only be element 46. After discussing the remaining elements in the Drawings and the Specification, the Examiner concluded that it would be clear that each of the elements had been disclosed in the original Specification, albeit with some minor typographical errors and omissions, thus no new matter had been introduced..